



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,705	03/09/2004	Scott Meredith	M61.12-0596	2881
27366 7590 04/17/2009 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
TAKLE, MISEKER				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2175				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/796,705

Applicant(s)

MEREDITH, SCOTT

Examiner

MESEKER TAKELE

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9, 16, 19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9, 16, 19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 01/13/2009.
2. Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 16, 19 and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16 and 19 are independent claims. In the instant Amendment, claims 1, 16 and 19 were amended and claims 5-6, 8-15, 17-18 and 20 were cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. Per Applicants argument the claims, 1-4, 6-7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18 and 19-20
35 U.S.C. 101rejections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 16, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Moore (US Pub No: 2002/0078069) in view of Linyard et al. ("Linyard" US Pub No.: 2002/0023144).

As to claim 1, Moore discloses, A computer-implemented method for creating a task identifier for identifying a file within a system for providing help content to a

Art Unit: 2175

computer operator (paragraph 27 – paragraph 35, abstract and Figure 1 (element 216)), the method comprising: providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements that together form the task identifier, the task identifier being indicative of a help-related task described in the content of the file (example, History, Math, Science and English, see paragraph [0031]), providing access to a collection of taxonomic organization data, wherein the taxonomic organization data relates each word selection in the limited set to a taxonomic category, and wherein the taxonomic category for each word selection is not apparent in the word selection itself (paragraph [0031] and [0038]), receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of a particular word selection from the limited set of word selections (example, user make selection (e.g., “MATH”), see paragraph [0034]).

However Moore does not specifically disclose (a) help-related task described in the content of the file (b) automatically determining, based at least in part on a reference to the taxonomic organization data, a particular taxonomic category that corresponds to the particular word selection, wherein automatically determining is a step conducted by a computer processor that is a functional component of the computer; automatically assigning the particular taxonomic category to the file;

(c) assigning said file to more than one taxonomic category based on the selection received from the user; and enabling a user to sort the file based on the particular word selection or based on the particular taxonomic category, wherein the result of a sort based on the particular taxonomic category is not the same as the result of a sort based on the particular word selection.

Linyard from the same field of endeavor disclose (a) help-related task described in the content of the file (such as, The system and method provide a modular self-help capability that can be attached to a website or other information source that can be searched and updated to modernize the help environment, paragraph [0007]) (b) automatically determining, based at least in part on a reference to the taxonomic organization data, a particular taxonomic category that corresponds to the particular word selection, wherein automatically determining is a step conducted by a computer processor that is a functional component of the computer; automatically assigning the particular taxonomic category to the file (such as, categorized and stored, a system and method for incorporating software modules into a website or other information source that is searchable and updateable, which helps to create a dynamic user assistance environment. The system searches based on context/category sensitive natural language requests, abstract and paragraph [0009]);

(c) assigning said file to more than one taxonomic category based on the selection received from the user; (such as, a system for providing user assistance, the system comprising a question module adapted to receive at least one question from a user, a context module adapted to identify at least one category that is associated with the context in which the question was received, and a knowledge module adapted to identify an answer to a received question, wherein the answer is derived using at least in part the identified category, paragraph [0009] and enabling a user to sort the file based on the particular word selection or based on the particular taxonomic category, wherein the result of a sort based on the particular taxonomic category is not the same as the result of a sort based on the particular word selection (such as, In certain embodiments, the user

Art Unit: 2175

assistance system 210 allows user assistance categories to be user defined. In these embodiments, categories are a subset of the knowledge data 374, and may be defined or customized by the content owners or help providers according to their particular needs. In this manner, the system 210 may be readily adapted to fulfill a plurality of customer requirements. Additionally, questions, for example FAQs or question/answer pairs, may have a plurality of categories defined for them, thereby further enhancing the adaptability of the system 210 allowing for further customer customization, paragraph [0085]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with help files as presented by Linyard.

The motivation to combine to provide user assistance, the system comprising a question module adapted to receive at least one question from a user, a context module adapted to identify at least one category that is associated with the context in which the question was received, and a knowledge module adapted to identify an answer to a received question, wherein the answer is derived using at least in part the identified category.

As to claim 2, Moore discloses providing the user with a second limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a second of the plurality of elements (example, such as a list box appears with a list of classes, see paragraph [0029])

receiving a second selection from the user that is indicative of a word selection from the second limited set of word selections; and assigning said word selection from

Art Unit: 2175

the second limited set of word selections to represent the second of the plurality of elements (example, student selects date or sequential number, see paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 3, Moore discloses wherein providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements comprises providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an object element (example, History, Math, Science and English see paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 4, Moore discloses wherein providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements comprises providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an action element (example “find”, see paragraph [0039]).

As to claim 7, Moore discloses wherein the pluralities of elements are arranged in accordance with a predetermined structure of organizational elements (predetermined document structure, see paragraph [0021]).

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. More further disclose assigning the first taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user; assigning a second taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set of word selections (such as, defining a first document control object for a first group of documents, the first document control object specifying at least one of file naming, storage location, automatic backup, distribution, and access restriction for the first group of documents; and defining a second document control object for a

Art Unit: 2175

second group of documents, the second document control object specifying at least one of file naming, storage location, automatic backup, distribution, and access restriction for the second group of documents, wherein at least one parameter for file naming, storage location, automatic backup, distribution, and access restriction within the second document control object differs from a corresponding parameter within the first document control object, claim 23).

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. Moore further discloses wherein each task identifier includes an element selected from a limited vocabulary (example, such as document control object, name of the directory for each class, the string, see paragraph [0034] and figure 1, element 216).

As to claim 21, Moore discloses wherein the pluralities of elements are arranged in accordance with a predetermined structure of organizational elements (example, list box appears with list of classes (linguistic means list of all the classes for that category) see .paragraph [0029]).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MESEKER TAKELE whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2175

(571)270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meseke Takele/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175